



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ties, whose teaching was accredited by the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit—i. e., by miracles.

OBJECTION 4.—Protestants assert that the church of the living God is not the pillar and ground of truth, but may, and often does, uphold damnable errors.

Their own Bible expressly declares, 1 Tim. iii. 15, that the church of the living God is the pillar and ground of the truth, and, consequently, cannot uphold damnable errors.

REPLY.—Protestants certainly do deny that this passage—whatever it means—does or can allude to the Church of Rome, since the church in which Timothy was to “know how he ought to behave himself,” was that of which he was bishop—i. e., Ephesus, and not Rome. But Roman Catholics are accustomed to take it for granted that whatever is said in Scripture concerning “the church” must apply to the Church of Rome; and hence the above mistake. They should prove this assumption by Scripture.

But with respect to the passage here quoted from the Epistle to Timothy, the sense of it evidently depends on the punctuation; and some of the ablest divines are convinced that there should be a full stop at “Church of God,” and then the succeeding sentence will run thus: “A pillar and ground of the truth, and without controversy great is the mystery of godliness:” which mystery the apostle proceeds to state was, God manifest in the flesh, &c., &c. And every scholar must admit that the words of the original Greek will bear that sense as well as the other.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

THE REAL PRESENCE.

We insert the following able correspondence between the Rev. R. A. Wilson, of Glasgow, and the Rev. W. Carson, of Waterford, with which we were favoured last month, but which reached us too late for insertion in our last number:—

Abercromby-street, Glasgow,

February 18, 1852.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—Mrs. F. has enclosed to me a communication received from you, containing what you consider three unanswerable difficulties to the Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist. I regret I did not receive them when in Waterford, as time and opportunity were then at my disposal. However, I shall be happy at any time to steal a few moments from the press and hurry of my daily duties, to answer or explain any difficulty which you may be pleased to propose, and trust you will dispassionately read and study my reply. I am likewise fully satisfied that you may make whatever honourable use you may please of them. I say honourable, because should you please to give them publicity at any future time, I should request that my answers should not be curtailed, even as to a sentence, inasmuch as the duties of the Glasgow mission are so incessant, that I shall never, perhaps, have a fair opportunity to say all I might wish; and, therefore, there will be nothing said which will not be to the point, whilst I must, necessarily, omit much which might be added with benefit. Your first objection is substantially as follows:—

Paschasius, in the year 831, was the first person who wrote a treatise on transubstantiation. He was opposed by Raban Maur, a Catholic Archbishop, and by Heribald and others. Although you have not drawn your conclusions from these premises, I premise I am justified in anticipating it, by saying, therefore, the doctrine of transubstantiation dates from Paschasius, in the ninth century.

Reverend sir, Paschasius did not write a treatise on “transubstantiation;” but (A.D. 818) he wrote one on the body and blood of Christ, in which he advanced no new doctrine, but merely gave the doctrine of the universal Church in the 9th century. His words are, and I beg of you to consider them attentively—“Although some err through ignorance, yet no person, as yet, has publicly called into question what the whole world believes and confesses.” “Quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errent, nemo tamen est adhuc in aperto, qui hoc ita esse contradicat quod totus orbis credit et confitetur.” And, again, he says—“Let him who would contravene this truth, consider what he does against his Lord, and against all the Church of Christ. It is, therefore, a most grievous crime to pray with all, and not believe what truth teaches, and what all the Christians of the universe profess.” “Videat qui contra hoc venire voluerit, quid agat contra ipsum dominum et contra omnem Christi ecclesiam. Nefarium ergo scelus est, orare cum omnibus et non credere quod veritas ipsa testatur et ubique omnes universaliter verum esse fatentur.” Now, it is not denied, even by Protestant writers, that Paschasius maintained, during life, a character eminent both for sanctity and learning, and I, therefore, dispassionately put the question—Is the above the language of a man broaching a new theory on a most vital point of Catholic doctrine? or should not Paschasius have been absolutely demoted in asserting, in the face of the world, that the belief in the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist, was the universal faith of Christianity

at the moment he was writing, when, in reality, it was nowhere believed, but was merely his own private speculation. I have no doubt, reverend sir, but that you will acknowledge the full force of this observation, if you bestow due attention to the testimony which I have above adduced.

You say that Paschasius was opposed by Raban Maur and others. Now, reverend sir, I admit it, for the sake of giving you all the advantage you can desire, although you must be aware, that neither Catholics nor Protestants agree as to the precise doctrine of the opponents of Paschasius. The manuscript epitome of William of Malmesbury joins Amalarius, Heribald, and Raban, in the same opposition to the true Catholic doctrine, but accuses them of being Stercoranists, and, therefore, implying an error as opposed to the doctrine of the Sacramentarians which you hold, as it is opposed to the doctrine held by the Catholic Church. But, suppose, as I said, for the sake of argument, that their opinions favoured your doctrine with regard to the blessed Eucharist, what follows? Therefore, persons holding communion with the Catholic Church in the ninth century were at liberty to call in question the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the blessed Eucharist. Reverend sir, this conclusion is not justified by the premises. The Church of Lyons, in the celebrated Three epistles, accused Amalarius “of poisoning the faith of Catholic France, by writings full of error and strange opinions,” and declares that his writings should be burned, and in the year 838 the errors of Amalarius and of his followers, Raban and Heribald, were again condemned by a synod of Bishops, held at Cressy. Therefore, reverend sir, it was not a matter of indifference in the ninth century to deny the real presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist; but as the doctrine of Raban had but few supporters, it was allowed to die a natural death, not without having been reprobated, as I have shown, but without causing any great commotion in the church. John Scot revived the controversy in the middle of the ninth century, but he found no partisans, and again it died with him, and remained dead until the eleventh century, when it was revived by Berengarius, and as soon condemned by a synod convoked at Rome, by Leo the ninth, in the year 1050, and in the following year by the synod of Versailles, at which the work of Scotus was consigned to the flames, in execration of its heretical doctrine. Berengarius made a public retraction in another council, held at Turin, in the year 1055, and again in a synod of 113 bishops, convoked at Rome in the year 1059, from the various kingdoms of Europe. His retraction was sent by order of the synod to the various countries of Europe, for the purpose of repairing the scandal which the publicity and noise of his errors had given, and the heresy was thus, for the present, cut off in its very bud. Now, reverend sir, Paschasius announces publicly what was the universal belief of his age. The Church of Lyons, the synod of Cressy, and all the subsequent synods and councils held in Italy, France, and Germany, confirm his statement; wherefore I conclude, and I hope you will candidly say very justly, that the doctrine of the real presence was really the universal doctrine of the Christian church in the ninth and subsequent, as well as preceding centuries; and that if a few in the ninth century disputed the doctrine, they, by doing so, went against the universal faith of the Christian Church, and thereby incurred the severe animadversion and condemnation of the Catholic churches and bishops of the age in which they lived. In fine, that in proportion as the error of a few became more likely to do injury to the Catholic faith, in proportion did the church increase her energies to repress those evils, by condemning the errors themselves; causing the books containing the objectionable doctrines to be burned in abhorrence of them, and multiplying synods and councils until it terminated in the œcumenical Council of Trent.

But, reverend sir, I must not pass by another point in the proposed difficulty on which you seem to lay peculiar stress. You say Paschasius first wrote a treatise on transubstantiation in the year 831. Reverend sir, I do not suppose that you mean to assert the existence of a treatise as essential to the belief in transubstantiation; you might as well argue that the sun did not give light for some thousands of years, because so long no learned treatise appeared on the nature and properties of light. You certainly do not mean this. Then, I suppose, you mean by the word first, that Paschasius was the first to teach the doctrine of transubstantiation. If so, please open St. Cyril's works, and bear in mind that this holy Bishop of Jerusalem lived 500 years before Paschasius. You will find in his Fourth Catechism for catechumens, in language written expressly for the purpose of communicating instruction to beginners, the following discourse:—“When Christ himself has said of the bread, this is my body, and of the chalice, this is my blood, who will dare to doubt? Formerly he changed water into wine, and will we consider him unworthy of being believed when he changes wine into his blood? Judge it not by the taste but by faith. What seems to be bread is not bread, and what seems to be wine is not wine, although it may seem such to the taste; but it is the blood of Christ.” Reverend sir, what do you call this, if it be not the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation? Open St.

Ambrose, and you will find the following (Lib. de Initiandis, c. 48)—“Perhaps you will say, how can you assert that I receive the body of Christ, when I see something else? If the word of Christ was able to bring into existence what before did not exist, how much more easily is it not able to change things which are into what they are not?” Again, reverend sir, I ask, is not this transubstantiation? It would be superfluous to multiply testimonies. If, however, you require more, equally explicit, I shall be happy to supply you with them; but from what I have adduced, it is evident that, even if Paschasius were the first to write a treatise on transubstantiation, he was not certainly the first to teach and believe in the doctrine implied by it. It would likewise throw upon you, reverend sir, the extremely difficult task of explaining how it is that the eastern heretical churches separated from the communion of Rome since the beginning of the 5th century, and as opposed to her doctrines fully as much as is the Church of England since the Reformation, have become imbued with this Catholic tenet of the real presence of Christ in the blessed eucharist, which, nevertheless, Eutychians, Nestorians, and Arminians, as well as Greeks, defend and teach. Did they, too, receive it from the Latin monk?

In your second difficulty, you say, “the seventh general council held in Constantinople in the year 754, decreed that the sacrament was a commemoration, not a sacrifice.” Allow me, reverend sir, to correct an historical mistake into which you have fallen. There was no general council held in Constantinople in the eighth century, and, consequently, I know not where to look for the decree to which you allude. Catholics are not wont to confound the idea of a sacrament with that of a sacrifice, nor to say that the sacrament is the sacrifice; nevertheless, making the proper allowance for your want of correct information on this point, I shall be happy to be informed of the name of the council you refer to, the number of the decree, and the year when celebrated, so that I may be able, with accuracy, to refer to this (at least to me) novel decision.

Your third difficulty states, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not an article of Catholic faith until the decision of the Council of Trent. Reverend and dear sir, you completely mistake the power of councils with regard to Catholic faith. The Catholic Church has her faith prior to the convocation of a council; nor is it in the power of any council, general or particular, to make that which previously was not contained in the body of Catholic faith, become, by its decision, an article of faith. The entire power of the church, assembled in council, as regards faith, is merely to declare that to be really contained in the Catholic faith which was contained from the beginning—which the church believed and taught from the beginning. Disputes and doubts affecting individual persons, places, or churches, sometimes render the true faith of the church obscure in those places, and the obscurity is removed by the universal church represented in council, which is not affected by local doubts or difficulties, but which has in its decisions the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost. In the fourth century the Council of Nice declared that the Son was consubstantial with the father, and anathematized whoever would deny the doctrine; but would you, reverend sir, thence infer, that the consubstantiality of the Father and Son was not contained in the deposit of Christian faith, or was not believed by the Church of God from the very foundation of Christianity? Apply this to the Council of Trent and you will have a case precisely parallel.

I remain, reverend dear sir, with sincere respect,
Yours truly in Christ,
R. A. WILSON.

John's-Hill, Waterford,
March 11, 1852.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 18th ult. I regret time did not permit me to answer it immediately.

You commence your letter by saying, “Mrs. F. has enclosed to me a communication received from you, containing, what you consider, three unanswerable difficulties to the Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the blessed Eucharist.” This statement is not quite correct. The following are the facts of the case.

I had, on several occasions, conversations with Mrs. F. on the points of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants. I stated to her, on one of these occasions, that I was prepared to show her religion to be a novel one, and to point out certain dates about which the various errors crept into the church. She asked me to give her such a date for the doctrine of transubstantiation. I wrote at the time, and partly from memory, the few hurried lines you received. She told me she would show them on the following day to some of the Waterford priests, and demand from them an answer; but, I suppose, they were not able to give her one, and, as a dernier resort, she forwarded them to you. Nor am I surprised at this, as a few days previously she had informed me, that not one of the Roman Catholic clergymen in Waterford was able either to write or preach a sermon—controversial or otherwise; and assigned this as a reason for their not

answering our sermons published in the newspapers, though repeatedly challenged to do so; and for their bringing down from Dublin, Drs. Cahill and O'Connell, to preach for them on controversy. A strange confession coming from your sister!—Doubtless she had it from you!

You have fully stated the premises of my first objection; but the conclusion is not the one intended to be drawn from them. They were not meant to prove that the doctrine of transubstantiation dates from Paschasius, or that he was the first to teach the doctrine; nor did I undertake to point out any *precise* period at which this error began, or name any particular person who introduced it. Paschasius, as Bellarmine confesses, was the first to systematize the doctrine of transubstantiation, and he found the materials at his hand, among the many and gross conceits which possessed the minds of men in that dark and barbarous age. The fact is that no error of the Romish system was brought in at once; but springing from the corrupt soil of the human heart, each arose insensibly and by slow degrees, as a young plant grows up from the seed, strengthening and spreading, till at length it fixes its roots deep in the earth, and sheds its noxious influence far and wide. We cannot, therefore, point out the precise period when these errors first began, no more than a man can tell the time his hair began to be gray, or his garments to be old. Only by comparing what the Church of Rome is now with what she was in the apostolic and primitive ages of the church, we perceive that many gross corruptions have been introduced. Slowly and imperceptibly, in the midnight darkness of the world and the church, they arose, and were shaped and moulded by degrees, as men's minds were prepared to look upon them, till each monster received its perfect form from the plastic hands of the Council of Trent. The gradual way in which the doctrine of transubstantiation was brought into the church, has been well described by a learned writer of the present day—"Men first, in spite of our Lord's warning, that the spirit only quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, began to fancy that Christ's flesh, as such, had the power of giving life, then that Christ's body was present in the bread, or that the bread by some mysterious change became, to all intents and purposes of giving life all one with Christ's body; and, lastly, that it was not bread at all, but Christ's body hidden under the appearance of bread." Thus broached, as a matter of opinion, it was then brought in by power, and lastly, by authority, decreed into an article of faith.

Paschasius was the first to write an express work on the subject of transubstantiation, the title of which was, "Concerning the body and blood of Christ;" and this is of itself a plain presumption against its primitive antiquity. But, add to this, that he was at once opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Heribald, Scotus, Ratramn, and others—that no sooner was the doctrine openly and publicly advocated, but it met with the most determined opposition, that the first attempt to put it forward as a necessary part of Christian faith, received the most unequalled reprobation from men of high repute in the church, some of whom have been canonized by the Church of Rome, and all of whom have been acknowledged by Bellarmine to be acute and learned men; and is not the conclusion from these premises plain, that the doctrine was a novelty, unknown in the pure and better ages of the church, and that even in the ninth century, it was at most, only a disputable doctrine, and could not have been the *universal* faith of the Christian Church—a doctrine of *universal* belief.

You claim for this doctrine a universal consent; but how can that be, when it met with the most decided opposition? That is a strange *universal* consent, to a doctrine which consists in its being believed by all except those who reject it! Nor is it any answer to this to say, that the opinions of those who opposed it, were condemned; any censure upon them, does not remove their opposition, for the absence of any evil does not consist in its being censured when it arises, but in its not arising at all. The fact still remains, that men in communion with the Church of Rome, of high reputation in it for their learning and abilities, never condemned in their own age, which is the point in dispute, and never condemned by any general council antecedent to the Council of Trent, gave the most determined opposition to the first attempt to fix the doctrine on the church, and branded it as a novelty unknown in its purest and best ages. It will avail nothing to call Ratramne and the others heretics, because they opposed an *almost* universal opinion. The burden of proof lies upon you, to show that they were not members of the church, for if they were, then the church did not generally hold the doctrine of transubstantiation. But if it be said, that Ratramne was not a Catholic, because he opposed this doctrine, then the same must be proved with regard to Augustine and the other Fathers whom he quotes, and whose opinions he shows inconsistent with it.

You speak as if we Protestants denied the *real* presence of Christ in the Eucharist; now, we hold it as firmly as you; we even assert, that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper;" the point in dis-

pute between us is, whether Christ's real presence in the eucharist is *spiritual* or *corporeal*.

Before, then, I show that the passages you bring forward from the Fathers do not prove transubstantiation, and give some quotations from them against that doctrine, it would be well to lay down clearly what transubstantiation is.

As you have mentioned the recantation of Berengarius, we cannot do better than refer to the form prescribed for him, as of course it must be esteemed a correct account of the doctrine of your church. He was required to declare at a council held in Rome, under Nicholas II., in the year 1058, "that the bread and wine, after consecration, are not only the sacrament, symbol, or figure, but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are sensibly not only in a sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the priests, and crushed by the teeth of the faithful (*fideliū dentibus atteri*)."

The Council of Trent is yet more precise. I refer you to canons 1, 2, 3, 4, "On the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, session 12."

Canon 1. "If any one shall deny that the body and blood, together with the *soul and divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, therefore, entire Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, and shall say that he is only *in it as in a sign, or in a figure, or virtually*, let him be accursed."

Canon 2. "If any one shall say that the *substance* of the bread and wine *remains* in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the *whole substance* of the bread into the body, and of the *whole substance* of the wine into the blood, the outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be accursed."

Canon 3. If any one shall deny that in the venerated sacrament of the Eucharist, *entire Christ is contained in each kind, and in each several particle of either kind, when separated*, let him be accursed."

Canon 4. "If any one shall say that, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is only in the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist in use whilst it is taken, and not either before or after, and that the *true body of the Lord does not remain in the hosts or particles which have been consecrated*, and which are reserved or remain after the communion, let him be accursed."

Again, I refer you to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, I quote from the edition printed at Venice, in the year 1582:—

"But now the pastors must here explain, that not only the *true* body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, *as the bones and nerves*, but also that *entire Christ* is contained in this Sacrament."

Again, I refer you to the Roman Missal. Amongst the rubrics we read "of the defects that may occur in the celebration of masses"—

"If the consecrated host disappears, either by some accident—as by the wind—or by a miracle, or if it be *taken by any animal*, and cannot be found, then let another be consecrated."

Again—"If the priest vomits the Eucharist, if the accidents appear entire, let them be reverently taken, if there be not nausea."

In those documents, it is asserted that the substance of the bread and wine, immediately after consecration, undergoes a change, and are not merely symbols or figures, but the actual, real, and identical body of Christ, which suffered upon the cross; nor is this all, not merely is it asserted that the material bread and wine are converted into the material body and blood of Christ, but that material bread and wine are converted into the immaterial soul, and not only into the immaterial soul, but into the essential divinity of Christ. The assertion is, that in the mass "There is really, and truly, and substantially present, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ." And not only so, but that a whole Christ, body, soul, divinity, bones, and nerves, is present in the bread and in every particle of it, and in the wine, and in every drop of it; so that, were you to divide the bread or wafer into a thousand different crumbs, or the wine into a thousand different drops, each crumb or each drop would still contain the nerves, bones, sinews, body, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ; or if the wafer received by the communicant, into the mouth, should break into smaller pieces, each separate fragment, however small, becomes a separate, entire Christ. Still further, that an animal, as it is expressed in the Roman missal, or a mouse, as was defined by Greg. II. (Direct inquisit: part I, No. 15), may run away with and eat the host—i.e., the Lord Jesus, body, blood, soul, divinity, bones, and nerves; and, lastly, that a priest may vomit him. Oh, who can listen even to this simple statement without feelings of indescribable horror? This is the very creed of your church, not distorted, not exaggerated in a single point, but expressed in the very terms of your own formularies—that the consecrated wafer

becomes the very body, blood, soul, divinity, bones, and nerves of Jesus Christ—*becomes God*—that a mouse may run away with and eat that God, the God of heaven and earth—the Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts—that mighty Being who arched the heavens—who gemmed the firmament with ten thousand stars—who controls the whole machinery of the universe—before whom angels veil their faces as they cry, "Holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, who was, and is, and is to come." "Be astonished, oh, ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, yea, be very desolate, saith the Lord."

The passages you have adduced from the writings of Cyril and Ambrose, speak of the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ, but does this prove transubstantiation? If so, then the Church of England holds that doctrine when she asserts that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper." You must show in *what sense* they are the body and blood of Christ, whether carnally or spiritually. How St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, the very writer you quote, understood it, is evident when he says—"With all assurance let us partake as of the body and blood of Christ, for, under the *type* of bread, his body is given unto thee; and under the *type* of wine, his blood is given unto thee; that so thou mayest partake of the body and blood of Christ, being one body and one blood with him." (Cyril, oper. Cat. xxii. mystag. iv., sec. iii., Fol. Bened., Edit. 1720.) How St. Ambrose, the other writer you quote understood it, is evident when he says, "Make this ascribed oblation reasonable and acceptable, which is the *figure* of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Ambros. ope. Tom ii., De Sacrament, lib. iv., cap. 5, fol. edit. Bened., 1690.) How St. Augustine, one of the most celebrated doctors of the church, who flourished in the fourth century, understood it, is evident when he says, in his epistle to Boniface the bishop—"If the sacraments had not some resemblance to these things of which they are the sacrament, they would not be sacraments at all, but from their resemblance they often take the name of the things themselves, so then, *after a certain sort*, the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ, is the blood of Christ." Again, St. Augustine writes—"The Lord when he gave the *sign* of his body, did not doubt to say, this is my body; and again, in the history of the New Testament, so great and so marvellous was the patience of our Lord, that, bearing with Judas, though not ignorant of his purpose, he admitted him to the banquet, in which he commended and delivered to his disciples the *figure* of his own body and blood."

You seem to lay great stress upon the words of Cyril, "Judge it not by the *taste*, but by faith," and yet, this is so far from proving transubstantiation, that it is in perfect accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England, when she declares that the faithful only receive the body and blood of Christ, but that all others are guilty of his body and blood. Again, you have underlined the words of St. Ambrose—"How can I receive the body of Christ, when I see something else?" but this would prove him as much a Protestant as a Romanist, for we, too, as I said before, hold, that the body of Christ is received by the faithful in the Lord's supper.

Again, the passages which you have adduced, speak of a change having taken place in the elements after consecration; but this will not answer your purpose, unless you also show the *kind* of change implied; we admit that some of the Fathers speak of a mysterious change having taken place in the elements, but we altogether deny that that change was of that *kind* or *character* above described as transubstantiation. It rests with you to show that it is a corporeal or carnal change, but from other parts of their writings we can prove to demonstration that such a doctrine never entered into their minds.

The first I shall adduce is from Clement, of Alexandria, who lived in the second century, and whose name carries great weight in the Church of Rome. His words are as follows:—

"Inasmuch as Christ declared, that the bread which I give you is my flesh, inasmuch as flesh is irrigated by blood, therefore the wine is *allegorically* called blood. For the word is allegorically designated by many different names, such as meat, and flesh, and nourishment, and bread, and blood, and milk; for the Lord is all things for the enjoyment of us who have believed in him. Nor let any one think that we speak strangely, when we say that milk is *allegorically* called the blood of the Lord, for is not wine likewise *allegorically* called by the same appellation? The Scripture, therefore, has named wine a *mystic symbol* of the holy blood." And, again—"Be well assured that Christ himself also partook of wine, inasmuch as he also is a man. He, moreover, blessed the wine, saying, Take, drink; this is my blood, the blood of the vine. The consecrated liquor of exhilaration, therefore, *allegorically* represents the word, who poured himself out on behalf of man, for the remission of sins."

Again, Cyprian writes as follows:—

"We have found out that it was a mixed cup which our Lord offered, and that it was wine which he called his blood."

Again, St. Augustine writes—"Christ instructed his disciples and said unto them, It is the Spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life; as if he had said, *understand spiritually* what I have spoken—You are *not* about to eat this identical body which you see; and you are *not* about to drink this identical blood, which they who crucify me will pour out; on the contrary, I have commended a certain sacrament to you which will vivify you, if spiritually understood." It would be superfluous to multiply testimonies; if, however, you require more, equally explicit, I shall be happy to supply you with them.

In the second place, you have undertaken to correct an historical mistake into which you say I have fallen. You state there was no general council held in Constantinople in the eighth century. I would advise you for the future, when you undertake to correct mistakes, to take care that you do not fall into a more grievous one yourself, for there was a general council held in Constantinople in the eighth century. "Making the proper allowance for your want of correct information on this point," I proceed to inform you, that it was called by Constantine, in 754, at Constantinople, to whom, it appears, the furious tribe of image worshippers, in derision, had given the name of Copronymus. It was composed of eastern bishops. It condemned the worship and use of images. This council, I am aware, is not acknowledged by Roman Catholics, any more than the authority of the second commandment, because it had not received the sanction of the see of Rome; nevertheless, its testimony is of great value on the subject in dispute, as showing that the Trentine doctrine of transubstantiation was not universally received or believed in the early ages of the Christian Church. It maintained that "Christ chose no other shape or type under heaven by which to represent his incarnation, but the sacrament which he delivered to his ministers for a type and effectual commemoration, commanding the substance of bread to be offered, which did not in any way resemble the form of man, that no occasion might be given for bringing in idolatry."

In regard to the third difficulty, you state that I have mistaken the power of a council which is only to declare or authoritatively set forth as true, any point of doctrine, so that what before might have been disputed or doubted without danger, becomes now necessary to be believed, and heresy to dispute or doubt.

According to your own definition, then, till it becomes an article of faith, it is a disputable doctrine which may or may not be held by those who remain in communion with the Church of Rome; and, therefore, since the doctrine of transubstantiation was not declared an article of faith till the Council of Trent, the belief of the doctrine was not essential till then, and those who denied it must not be considered as heretics. Between this and the Council of Nice there is no parallel, for almost immediately on the promulgation of Arius's opinions, the Council of Nice assembled, and those opinions were declared heretical. Arius first put forward his erroneous views in 318, and in 325 the council condemned them, an interval only of seven years; but the doctrine of transubstantiation was disputed, fiercely disputed, from the time of Paschasius in the ninth century, and not terminated as you yourself have stated till the oecumenical Council of Trent in the 16th century. Therefore, transubstantiation was not till then a doctrine of the church, or a necessary part of Christian faith. Indeed the celebrated Breerly says: "complete transubstantiation (i.e., both for form and matter), was not determined until the last Council of Trent in the year 1560."

But think not that it is through the decrees of councils, or the testimony of the Fathers, or the writings of fallible men, however pious or however learned, that we alone attack the doctrine of transubstantiation. We have a more powerful weapon than any of them, and that is the sword of the Spirit—the Word of the living God.

I know you will shrink from Scripture, for as Scotus (4 Sent. d. 11, q. 3), says—"There is no passage of Scripture so express as evidently to compel the admission of transubstantiation, without the declaration of the church;" or, as Biel says (in Can. Miss. lect. 40), "It is nowhere found in the canonical Scriptures;" or, as Cardinal Cameracensis says—"Transubstantiation cannot be proved from Holy Writ;" or, as Cardinal Cajetan says—"There does not appear out of the Gospel anything to compel us to understand these words literally, namely, 'This is my body;' and, truly, that presence in the sacrament, which the church holds, cannot be proved by these words of Christ, unaided by the declaration of the church."

You hold that when Christ, at the last supper, took the bread and cup into his hands, and said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," these words are to be taken in their most strict and literal sense, and, that, therefore, the bread did actually become changed into the Saviour's body, and the wine into his blood. But if you will abide by this literal interpretation, you must carry out the principle much further than you do. We know, from 1 Cor. xi. 25, and from St. Luke, that our Lord said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Have I not, then, as good reason for asserting

that the cup is transubstantiated into the New Testament as you have for saying that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of our Lord?

But from the words of our Lord, immediately after consecration, we learn that no transubstantiation had taken place; for he calls the consecrated element "the fruit of the vine"—"But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."—Matt. xxvi. 29.

Moreover, it was when our Lord was celebrating the Passover with his disciples, that he instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Now, it was customary among the Jews for the head of the family to pronounce over the Paschal Lamb the words "This is the Lord's Passover;" as the head of the family he, too, must have pronounced over the Paschal Lamb, the words, "This is the Lord's Passover." The disciples knew the lamb was not really the passover, but that it was a sign, emblem or memorial of it, and when, immediately after the commemorative supper he institutes the Christian sacrament, and uses the same form of phrase respecting it, which a few moments before he had used respecting the Jewish sacrament, and says of the bread and wine, "This is my body broken or given," "This is my blood shed," it is impossible his disciples could have understood him otherwise than as implying, "This is the sign, emblem, or memorial of my body broken, and of my blood shed."

And such a way of speaking is quite common, and often used by our Lord himself. He declared, "I am the door," "I am the vine," "I am the shepherd." He was not literally a door, a vine, or a shepherd, but he was figuratively what they were literally. The Apostles had often heard our Saviour speak thus before, and they would naturally understand him to be speaking so then.

Nor do they afterwards put another meaning on his words. In his first epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul five times successively calls that bread which was consecrated, and which our Saviour calls his body.

We conclude, therefore, that the figurative is in this case that in which our Saviour's words must be understood. But to say that his words are to be taken in any other sense than that in which those who heard him would naturally understand him, is what I think none would venture to say, except those who have been carefully trained up to believe it such.

I am, dear sir, sincerely and faithfully yours,
WM. CARSON.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S PRAYER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In the last number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 45, you conclude your answer to "Amicus" with the words—"This is the interpretation of St. Augustine, book the 1st, on the Sermon on the Mount, cap. ii." In both the last numbers you have quoted the Holy Fathers as entirely against the doctrine of purgatory. I trust you will not refuse me, who am a very unskilled controversialist, a privilege which you have given and kindly promised to other Catholic laymen.

Then, let me suppose that you adduce the most powerful array of quotations, from the Holy Fathers, against the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, and that I, on the other hand, do adduce only one, from one only of the ancient Fathers of the Church. What then? The inference naturally must be, that such holy Father was not orthodox. I then, sir, refer you to the confessions of St. Augustine, book ix. chap. 13; and, at the same time, I beg leave to quote the following, from the above, for the attentive perusal of your readers.

The following then is the sublime and eloquent prayer of the great and truly orthodox St. Augustine for the repose of his mother's soul:—"And now, my heart being cured of that wound, [sorrow for his mother] I pour out to thee, my God, in behalf of her, thy servant, a very different kind of tears, issuing from a heart awed by the contemplation of the dangers of every soul that dies in Adam. For, although she, being revived in Christ, even before being freed from the flesh, and having lived so as that thy name is much praised in her faith, and virtues, yet I dare not say that no word came out of her mouth contrary to thy command, from the time thou didst regenerate her by baptism. I then, putting aside her good deeds, for which I give thanks with joy, *entreat thee at present, for the sins of my mother*, forgive them, O Lord; forgive them, I beseech thee, enter not into judgment with her." &c., &c.

With your permission, sir, I will use the right of "private judgment" and that of "reason" as to the above passage.

I need not now inquire, nor is it necessary, whether Monica died a saint or not. From the above passage, at least, it would seem that her son, St. Augustine, who knew her many virtues, was somewhat uneasy as to the repose of her soul in the other world. In your first article on purgatory, page 39, of the last CATHOLIC LAYMAN, you say "Christ, in fact, does not do his work of atonement by halves—remitting the guilt, and

yet leaving the punishment! Where the guilt is removed the punishment is so likewise, temporal as well as eternal. Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, all say this." Now, sir, why did St. Augustine entreat the merciful Saviour, who "does not do his work of atonement by halves," for St. Monica's sins? When her spirit quitted its remnant of clay, it was judged, and found either sinless or sinful—if the former, heaven, if the latter, hell was her reward. In either case, praying for her, or remembering her at the "altar," according to her own request, previous to her death, would be an idle and silly performance. Yet, it strikes me, that St. Augustine held a different doctrine; therefore, he continued to pray for her, and to remember her at the altar, hoping that the holy and all-saving sacrifice would atone for her human weakness and defects during life; for who can be sure that, during life, they have sufficiently satisfied the Divine justice?

Like St. Augustine, I shall, sir, until better instructed, continue to pray for the faithful departed.

And have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
A CATHOLIC.

Loughrea, April 24, 1852.

We find some things in our correspondent's letter that we must agree with, and something which we must ask him to consider again.

We agree with him, that if we "adduce the most powerful array of quotations from the Holy Fathers against the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, and that he, on the other hand, do adduce only one, from one only, of the Ancient Fathers of the church—what then? The inference naturally must be, that such Holy Father was not orthodox." If our correspondent had said—"Was not orthodox in this point," we would have thought his argument generally correct. Yet, even so (seeing that he has quoted only one Father), a regard for truth would prevent our urging this argument too far against him. There may be cases, and there are, in which it would be easy to bring more Fathers in favour of an error than against it. Let Roman Catholics only show that the doctrine of purgatory is taught in Scripture, and we will accept the opinion of one Father in its favour, although ten should be against it.

We must ask our correspondent to consider again the following passage of his letter:—"When her spirit quitted its tenement of clay, it was judged, and found either sinless or sinful; if the former, heaven; if the latter, hell was the reward. In either case, praying for her, or remembering her at the 'altar,' according to her own request, previous to her death, would be an idle and silly performance. Yet it strikes me that St. Augustine held a different doctrine."

Now, it strikes us so too; though, perhaps, not exactly in the same way; and it may strike our correspondent, as it does us, when he considers it again. He seems to think that St. Monica received her final judgment, either for heaven or hell, as soon as she departed from this life; and before St. Augustine prayed for her. For he goes on to say that, notwithstanding this judgment, St. Augustine continued to pray for her. We cannot see what room our correspondent leaves here for purgatory. If Monica must needs go either to heaven or to hell, as soon as she left this life, and before St. Augustine had time to pray for her, what time was there for her to go to purgatory at all? Did St. Augustine pray for her *after* she was in hell? We notice this, as showing how hard it is for Roman Catholics to write on this subject at all, without making admissions that overthrow purgatory altogether.

But we regard truth alone, and not victory; and we will help our correspondent out of this difficulty. In the Nicene creed, which he and we believe alike, it is said of Christ, "He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead." The judgment of all who have died since Christ first came, shall take place when Christ comes again into this world as judge. Therefore, St. Monica is not yet judged; she is still waiting for the judgment of Christ when he shall come, at the great day.

This gives a very different meaning to St. Augustine's prayer; but to show what that meaning is, we must give the prayer more fully than our correspondent, "A Catholic," has given it. We do not at all suppose, that he meant to give it wrongly; we are sure that he found it in some book just as he has given it, and that he thought it stood just as St. Augustine wrote it. But the book misled him; and we shall therefore give, as St. Augustine wrote it, marking with brackets, the parts omitted in "A Catholic's" letter.

"But now, with a heart cured of that wound . . . I pour out unto thee, our God, in behalf of that thy servant, a far different kind of tears, flowing from a spirit moved by the thoughts of the danger of every soul that dies in Adam. And although she, having been made alive in Christ, even while not yet released from the flesh, so lived that thy name should be praised in her life and conversation, yet, I dare not say that, from the time that thou didst regenerate her by baptism, no word came out of her mouth contrary to thy command. [And it was said by thy Son, The Truth, 'Whosoever shall say to his brother, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.' And woe be even to the commendable life of